



## **King County**

### **Department of Community and Human Services 2010 Business Plan**

#### **Introduction**

The King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS) manages a wide range of programs and services to assist the county's most vulnerable and troubled residents and strengthen its communities. These programs and services include housing and community development, work training programs, a range of community-based services, veterans programs, developmental disabilities, mental health, substance abuse prevention and treatment, unincorporated area liaisons, and public defense. The department receives input from and staffs ten distinct citizen advisory and oversight boards, in addition to numerous other workgroups and committees. Responsibility for oversight and management of the Veterans and Human Services Levy and implementation of its Service Improvement Plan, as well as implementation of the Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) Action Plan and oversight and management of the sales tax revenues rests with DCHS. The department also provides leadership and coordination to the Committee to End Homelessness in King County (CEHKC) and the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness.

As a primarily regional services department, DCHS plays a strong role in the coordination and leadership of the region's human services infrastructure. The majority of the department's programs and services are provided through contracts with community-based agencies. Of its total annual revenues, 85 percent of the DCHS budget is contracted to community agencies, about eight percent funds direct services provided by DCHS staff, and the remaining approximately seven percent funds administration.

Established priority areas are early intervention and prevention services, treatment, ending homelessness, criminal justice alternatives, employment and job training, and public defense services. The department's resources are targeted to these areas of business.

Coordination of resources and services is accomplished through the efforts of a small staff in the director's office and staff in four separate divisions: Community Services Division (CSD); Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD); Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division (MHCADSD); and the Office of the Public Defender (OPD).

#### **Policy Framework**

The Framework Policies for Human Services, revised and approved by the Metropolitan King County Council in April 2007, clarify the county's role and identify priorities for the use of discretionary funds for human services. These policies are consistent with many initiatives and plans adopted by the county in recent years, including the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness, Mental Health Recovery Plan, Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan, Veterans and Human Services Levy Service Improvement Plan, MIDD Action Plan, and both the adult and juvenile justice operational master plans, among others.

---

The policies directing human services for King County are as follows:

**HS-1: King County has a strong regional role in human services, working with many partners to help those most in need**

King County joins the human services community in promoting healthy families and safe communities, and building a coordinated regional human services system to serve the county's most vulnerable and at-risk residents. This work is accomplished through partnerships with many levels of government, service providers, civic and non-profit organizations, philanthropy, faith communities, businesses, schools, criminal justice agencies, human services advocates, and many others. King County is dedicated to working with its partners to identify and help the neediest individuals and families across the county achieve stability, recovery and an improved quality of life.

**HS-2: King County's priorities for human service investments will be programs and services that help to stabilize and improve people's lives, and prevent or reduce emergency medical and criminal justice system involvement and costs**

In order to continue to improve quality of life, counterbalance growth in areas costly to taxpayers and communities and preserve the resources necessary to collaborate as a partner in regional human services systems, King County has identified priority areas where it will focus its human services efforts and resources.

**HS-3: King County will apply principles that promote clarity, effectiveness, accountability and social justice**

King County will adhere to principles of public service in its human services-related actions and investments, including transparency in the administration of services, promotion of diversity, an orientation towards recovery and self-sufficiency, regional service system integration and coordination, and a focus on outcomes and performance measures developed in concert with human services stakeholders and partners.

## **Vision**

The Department of Community and Human Services supports and maintains vital communities, families and individuals.

## **Mission**

The Department of Community and Human Services seeks to enhance the quality of life, protect rights, and promote the self-sufficiency of our region's diverse individuals, families and communities.

## **Goals and Performance Measures**

In order to improve quality of life, have the greatest impact in helping those most in need and achieve the highest return on its investments, DCHS has identified five clear goals, all of which align with the framework policies, as well as the DCHS vision and mission statements. Performance measures have been developed to support each goal area.

**Performance Measures Contact: Rachael Black****Phone Number: 263-9098**

**GOAL I: Provide effective prevention and intervention strategies for those most at-risk and most in need to prevent or reduce more acute illness, high-risk behaviors, incarceration and other emergency medical or crisis responses.**

**Has this goal changed in the past year?** No

**Briefly describe your progress toward achieving this goal:** From 2007 to 2008, DCHS made progress towards this goal. Improvements were made in areas of substance abuse and mental health treatment and improved access to services for children with developmental disabilities.

**I-1 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Access rate for early intervention child development services

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients</b>								
1,634	1,875	2,106	2,179	1966	2545	2808	2820	2948
<b>Success</b>								
1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%	1.7%	1.9%	2%	2.2%	2.3%

**I-2 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Veterans with reduced symptoms of post traumatic stress disorder

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Veterans With Reduced Symptoms</b>								
57	68	166	156	Semi-annual	99	150	175	175
<b>Success</b>								
92%	99%	97.8%	95.7%	Semi-annual	88%	84%	95%	95%

**I-3 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Persons receiving outpatient mental health services who have maintained or improved their level of functioning

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients Who Maintained</b>								
NA	NA	NA	9,446	2,726	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Maintained</b>								
52.3%	57.1%	58.1%	58.4%	59.7%	52%	52%	55%	55%
<b>Clients Who Improved</b>								
NA	NA	NA	4,347	1,164	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Improved</b>								
28.9%	26.5%	26.3%	26.9%	25.5%	30%	30%	30%	30%

**I-4 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Persons completing outpatient chemical dependency treatment

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Adults</b>								
1,257	1,346	1,321	1,717	394	1,625	1,800	1,800	1,800
<b>Success</b>								
42.6%	44.5%	44%	54%	58.5%	48%	48%	48%	55%
<b>Youth</b>								
309	335	289	316	83	370	400	400	400
<b>Success</b>								
49.7%	59.9%	54.7%	58.8%	72.8%	62%	62%	60%	63%

**I-5 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Clients with developmental disabilities receiving substance abuse treatment

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
NA	40	39	44	41	39	39	44	45

**I-6 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Sexual assault victims increasing their ability to understand and cope with trauma <sup>1</sup>

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients With Increase</b>								
3,477	3,773	3,850	3,035	Semi-annual	NA	NA	NA	400
<b>Success</b>								
NA	NA	NA	78.7%	Semi-annual	NA	NA	90.0%	85%

**I-7 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Domestic violence victims completing a safety assessment and developing appropriate individualized safety plans <sup>2</sup>

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients Completing Plans</b>								
882	274	782	690	Semi-annual	900	NA	600	100
<b>Success</b>								
98.0%	97%	96.6%	97%	Semi-annual	85%	NA	80%	80%

<sup>1</sup> This is a new Business Plan measure for 2010. The target was established in anticipation of lower program funding with the discontinuation of “lifeboat” support.

<sup>2</sup> This measure was dropped from the 2008 Business Plan and restored in 2009. Targets for 2009 and 2010 have been set based on stricter standards for safety plans developed by participants.

**GOAL II: Provide job readiness, education and employment services to help vulnerable youth and adults increase independence and self-sufficiency and lead more meaningful and productive lives.**

**Has this goal changed in the past year?** No

**Briefly describe your progress toward achieving this goal:** As could be expected in recent economic times, employment targets are difficult to achieve. This is especially true for individuals who have barriers to employment, such as those with mental illness, chemical dependency or developmental disabilities. However, DCHS exceeded its goals for improving education and job placement for youth and improvement in job retention.

**II-8 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Youth clients who advance educationally or secure employment by program exit

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Youth Advancing</b>								
413	324	271	309	Semi-annual	NA	NA	NA	300
<b>Success</b>								
78.6%	76.1%	94.8%	94.8%	Semi-annual	78%	73.5%	95%	95%

**II-9 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Adult mental health clients who gain employment

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	224	66	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Success</b>								
2.9%	3.7%	3.8%	2.6%	2.7%	4%	4%	5%	4%

**II-10 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Adult chemical dependency clients who gain employment

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	265	48	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Success</b>								
8.8%	7.9%	6.7%	5.6%	4.8%	8%	8.5%	8.5%	5%

**II-11 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Adult Work Training clients who enter an employment program below self-sufficiency and achieve economic self-sufficiency by program end

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients Successful</b>								
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	300
<b>Success</b>								
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	50%	75%

**II-12 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Adult clients with developmental disabilities who are earning minimum wage or higher <sup>3</sup>

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients</b>								
NA	NA	777	840	801	NA	856	890	928
<b>Success</b>								
NA	52%	53%	45%	44%	NA	54%	50%	51%

**II-13 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Work training program participants who retain employment for three months or longer

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Adult Clients (KCJI + DWP) Remaining Employed</b>								
551	298	201	150	81	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Adults Successful</b>								
84%	91.9%	93.3%	86.2%	93.1%	85%	86%	86%	86%
<b>Youth Clients Remaining Employed or In School</b>								
165	109	76	139	39	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Youths Successful</b>								
65.5%	78.9%	62.8%	72%	66.1%	70%	86%	81%	75%

**GOAL III: Develop and implement stronger prevention measures to avoid or prevent homelessness, and create or preserve supportive housing for those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness to achieve the goal of ending homelessness in King County.**

**Has this goal changed in the past year?** No

**Briefly describe your progress toward achieving this goal:** While DCHS has had some success in preventing homelessness and securing housing units for homeless persons, resources for housing to place people in are not increasing at the rate needed to meet the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness goals.

<sup>3</sup> This measure was new for 2008.

**III-14 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Reduction in the number of people who are unsheltered or in the shelter system as compared to the same geographic area a year ago

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>One Night Count</b>								
NA	4,409	4,238	4,997	5,237	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Percent Reduction</b>								
NA	NA	-3.9%	17.9%	4.8%	-2%	-2%	-2%	-2%

**III-15 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Clients exiting emergency shelter or transitional housing who move to more stable housing (transitional or permanent)

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Exiting Emergency Shelter</b>								
<b>Clients</b>								
201	281	919	892	NA	NA	NA	900	940
<b>Success</b>								
49.5%	72.2%	64.7%	59.3%	NA	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%
<b>Exiting Transitional Housing</b>								
<b>Clients</b>								
467	665	636	803	NA	NA	NA	800	840
<b>Success</b>								
56.1%	70.6%	76.9%	74.6%	NA	70%	70%	70%	72%

**III-16 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Households who remain in their housing after receiving homeless prevention assistance

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients Housed 6 Months or More</b>								
1,038	929	680	443	NA	NA	1,000	706	706
<b>Success</b>								
67.2%	83.5%	82.7%	94.5%	NA	80%	80%	80%	80%

**III-17 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Increase in adults with serious mental illness exiting institutions and intensive case management who move to, and remain in, community-based treatment with stable housing

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	121	35	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Success</b>								
62.4%	63.7%	72.4%	82.9%	87.5%	71%	71%	71%	72%

**III-18 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Increase in homeless persons served in outpatient mental health services who are housed by the end of their benefit period

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	290	67	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Success</b>								
24.6%	27%	32.5%	33.3%	29.1%	30%	30%	30%	32%

**III-19 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Dedicated homeless housing units secured system-wide

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
496	463	481	662	409	550	600	600	450

**III-20 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Number of low income housing units funded

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
810	480	627	660	NA	290	400	600	500

**III-21 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Meet HUD timely commitment/expenditure deadlines

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>HOME</b>								
NA	NA	NA	NA	Annual	NA	NA	NA	Meet
<b>Community Development Block Grant</b>								
NA	NA	NA	NA	Annual	NA	NA	NA	Meet

**GOAL IV: Continue to develop and provide services that reduce the growth of emergency medical and criminal justice system involvement and costs.**

**Has this goal changed in the past year?** No

**Briefly describe your progress toward achieving this goal:** DCHS has successfully reduced incarceration for persons with mental illness and co-occurring disorders, and has reduced jail days for veterans. Services to youth have resulted in improvements over 2007 and new measures of youth progress have been added.

**IV-22 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Reduce incarcerations for persons with mental illness or co-occurring disorders who are receiving services

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Adult Mental Health Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	724	201	NA	NA	NA	NA



<b>Successful</b>								
69.9%	68.1%	70.1%	71.1%	73.9%	NA	70%	70%	70%
<b>Adult Co-Occurring Disorder Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	113	34	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Successful</b>								
69.8%	51.5%	59.7%	64.9%	66.7%	NA	60%	60%	60%
<b>Juvenile Mental Health Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	NA	24	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Successful</b>								
NA	NA	NA	NA	66.7%	NA	NA	70%	70%

**IV-23 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Individuals enrolled in mental health or combined mental health/substance abuse treatment who receive a service within seven days of jail release

<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Target</b>			
<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Q1 2009</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Adult Mental Health Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	1,005	357	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Received Service Within 7</b>								
62.4%	59.3%	57%	53.6%	68.7%	67%	66%	66%	66%
<b>Adult Co-Occurring Disorder Clients</b>								
NA	NA	NA	136	26	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Received Service Within 7</b>								
74.3%	66.9%	67.5%	74.7%	68.4%	75%	73%	73%	73%

**IV-24 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Reduce jail days for veterans <sup>4</sup>

<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Target</b>			
<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Q1 2009</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Veterans</b>								
162	250	148	188	23	NA	NA	NA	200
<b>Reduced Jail Days</b>								
7,721	5,942	14,092	15,210	1,739	7,500	8,000	8,000	8,000

**IV-25 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Youth involved with juvenile justice who decrease their number of juvenile court referrals or detention admissions

<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Target</b>			
<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Q1 2009</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Youth With Decreased Justice System Involvement</b>								
NA	76	54	52	NA	NA	NA	NA	52
<b>Successful</b>								
69%	76%	70.5%	82.5%	NA	87%	85%	85%	85%

<sup>4</sup> Method of calculation of days reduced was significantly changed in 2009; targets for 2009 and 2010 were established according to the new method.

**IV-26 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Youth served in youth development programs who report an increase in protective factors or a reduction in risk factors

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Youth Served</b>								
NA	NA	NA	13,301	Annual	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Successful</b>								
NA	NA	87%	90%	Annual	NA	NA	87%	89%

**IV-27 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Youth who achieve one or more goals in their case management plan

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Youth With Demonstrated Improvement</b>								
NA	NA	NA	690	Semi-annual	NA	NA	NA	690
<b>Successful</b>								
NA	NA	NA	84.5%	Semi-annual	NA	NA	85%	85%

**GOAL V: Assure quality public defense services.**

**Has this goal changed in the past year?** No

**Briefly describe your progress toward achieving this goal:** Service demand on OPD is dependent upon the actions of law enforcement and the prosecution, which makes it difficult to predict caseload, and affects variance. However, the number of complaints received continues to improve and is below expectations.

**V-28 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Minimize variance of actual defense caseload areas from contracted terms

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Felony</b>								
0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-15.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Misdemeanor</b>								
22.3%	25.9%	0.0%	-7.3%	-7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Juvenile</b>								
-7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Dependency</b>								
0.0%	7.0%	7.1%	-3.6%	-9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Contempt of Court</b>								
18.3%	17.1%	28.4%	3.6%	-5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Involuntary Treatment Act</b>								
-31.0%	-2.1%	9.3%	10.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Becca</b>								
-27.0%	29.3%	NA	-27.8%	-49%	NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**V-29 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Reduce number of days between notification to OPD of in-custody felony case filing and assignment to an attorney

<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Target</b>			
<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Q1 2009</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
NA	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

**V-30 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Timely contact of defendant by attorney within one business day (in-custody) or five days (out of custody) from the time case has been assigned

<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Target</b>			
<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Q1 2009</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>In Custody</b>								
81%	90%	91%	68%	Annual	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>Out of Custody</b>								
87%	98%	88%	88%	Annual	100%	100%	100%	100%

**V-31 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Reduce number of corrective actions found during quality assurance audits of the four public defense contractors

<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Target</b>			
<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Q1 2009</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
6.50	3.25	4.50	4.50	Annual	NA	NA	4.00	4.00

**V-32 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Reduce complaints received about OPD attorneys and percentage determined to be valid

<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Target</b>			
<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Q1 2009</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Number of cases assigned to OPD attorneys</b>								
29,153	31,837	30,387	26,132	6,391	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Number of complaints received</b>								
NA	93	184	93	8	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Percent of cases for which a complaint is filed</b>								
NA	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Number of complaints found valid</b>								
NA	NA	NA	3	1	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Percent complaints found valid</b>								
NA	NA	NA	3%	12.5%	NA	10.0%	10%	8%

**V-33 PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** Maintain agency case credit workload per attorney by case area

Actual Performance					Target			
2005	2006	2007	2008	Q1 2009	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Felony</b>								
NA	136	NA	128	Annual	150	150	150	150
<b>Misdemeanor</b>								
NA	392	NA	325	Annual	450	450	450	450
<b>Juvenile</b>								
NA	288	236	245	Annual	330	250	250	250
<b>Dependency</b>								
NA	160	145	144	Annual	180	180	180	180
<b>Contempt of Court</b>								
NA	261	277	177	Annual	225	225	225	225
<b>Involuntary Treatment Act</b>								
NA	388	454	472	Annual	410	410	410	410

**Current Environment**

Key accomplishments and the current status of major programs and initiatives for DCHS are described as follows.

**Director's Office**

- Committee to End Homelessness/Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness – The small staff of the CEHKC, hosted by DCHS, provides oversight and leadership to the implementation of the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness. Nationally recognized for innovation and effectiveness, CEHKC efforts focus on prevention, affordable and special needs housing creation, resource coordination, initiatives for target populations (e.g., homeless youth, families, chronic homelessness), legislative advocacy, and building the political will to understand that ending homelessness is possible. The CEHKC involves government, business, faith, housing and homeless service providers and advocates, criminal justice, philanthropy and others. The regional partners share many accomplishments, including the creation of 662 new housing units in 2008 (over 3,300 units total have been funded by CEHKC partners since 2005). Already in 2009, ten housing projects have opened or held ground breakings. Homeless prevention programs countywide helped over 5,000 people avoid homelessness and more than 3,000 households were able to exit homelessness in 2008, thanks to a continuum of housing and supportive services. Despite a national recession and rising unemployment, our region has not experienced the large increases in homelessness seen in other areas around the country. The CEHKC is working hard to provide the housing and supports necessary to prevent such an increase here.
- Funders Group – Another highlight for 2008 was the establishment of the Funders Group, creating a level of policy and resource coordination for homeless planning that did not previously exist. Comprised of all the major funders committed to ending homelessness in King County and chaired by the DCHS Director, the Funders Group

seeks to align resources and regional planning efforts focused on housing production and system efficiencies. Members include King County, Seattle, suburban cities, United Way of King County, Seattle and King County housing authorities, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

- DCHS Performance Measures – In an effort to improve the ability to track and monitor program outcomes, DCHS developed 33 distinct performance measures. A summary of progress is captured in one-page dashboard reports, produced quarterly and shared with the public on the DCHS Web site. They include CSD Veterans and Community Services; CSD Housing and Community Development; CSD Work Training Programs; DDD; MHCADSD; OPD; and the CEHKC. Internal dashboards look at DCHS human resources and information technology. See Appendix A.
- Unincorporated Area Councils – King County has formally recognized six unincorporated area councils, independent entities formed to improve information sharing and communication between county government and the residents of the county's unincorporated areas. Two DCHS staff serve as liaisons, working with other departments and elected officials to provide assistance to the UACs and local residents. In addition, DCHS coordinates the joint annual UAC community forum hosted by the County Executive and other meetings during the year with UAC leaders.
- Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) – A department-wide effort yielded a comprehensive business continuity plan describing how DCHS and its divisions would respond in the event of a prolonged and catastrophic event. The plan addresses how critical and essential services would be provided both in the immediate aftermath of a major event and during recovery, how staff will be kept informed, and how emergency response protocols would be activated and sustained.
- Green River Flood Planning – The potential for devastating flooding in the Green River flood plain has energized a considerable amount of emergency planning within DCHS, as several areas of business may be impacted. The Regional Justice Center houses OPD staff, as do several courts; OPD is involved in planning with its criminal justice partners to determine how services will continue in South King County should flooding force closure of some or all of these sites. Although located above the flood plain, WorkSource Renton could be impacted by loss of power or sewer and road closures. Several mental health and chemical dependency service providers are located in the impact areas, which could restrict access to treatment for clients. The department is working with its contract agencies and community partners to assist with preparation and distribution of flood warning and other educational materials for clients and establishing protocols for continuity of operations, which may involve relocating some services, telecommuting, or establishing alternate work/service sites.
- Juvenile Justice Systems Integration Initiative – A collaboration of youth serving systems and agencies joined together in 2005 to strategize ways to reach and serve youth involved in multiple systems. Partners include DCHS, the courts, child welfare, schools, mental health providers, youth and family service agencies, and others. The goal is to promote cooperation, coordination and integration of the policies, practices, programs and protocols of the partners in the child serving systems to improve

outcomes for youth and families. Grants and assistance from the Casey Family Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation *Models for Change* are helping to support the development and implementation of coordinated care and best practice models. A children's mental health plan was developed to facilitate connections to mental health services for justice involved youth, often as an alternative to detention. This ongoing initiative has several activities in progress to improve knowledge, understanding and access to care. These include a new Web site, an all-day seminar on cross system collaboration, and production of materials for educators, parents and providers.

- Equity and Social Justice – With its partners and contract agencies, DCHS continues to promote diversity, cultural competence and accountability in all areas of business. The department is examining access to and outcomes of services across different populations through the Equity and Social Justice Initiative lens for possible system improvements.

### **Community Services Division**

- Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan 2010-2012 – King County Housing and Community Development (HCD) coordinates and administers over \$18 million a year in federal funding - Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships, Emergency Shelter Grant, and Shelter Plus Care - on behalf of the county and King County Consortium cities (most, but not all, cities in King County). A three-year plan to set regional priorities for expenditure of those funds will be submitted for council approval and then submitted to HUD.
- Combined Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) – The HCD Program coordinates a joint funding round that brings together the major capital, supportive services and rental assistance funders in the region for one combined application process. The goal is to help nonprofit housing developers gain all the resources needed for their housing projects sooner, as a means to expedite completion. Partners include King County, City of Seattle, A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH), Seattle and King County housing authorities, United Way, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The 2008 coordinated NOFA funding led to the award of \$36 million that created 643 units of housing. The 2009 NOFA totals \$41 million, with awards to be announced in December.
- Housing Interim Loan Program – A new \$6 million interim loan program was developed in 2009 to be administered through the HCD Affordable Housing Capital Funding Program. The interim loan is a short-term loan that allows nonprofit housing developers to acquire property more quickly and expedite the development process. Loans are paid back when the agencies have gathered all the long-term and permanent financing needed for the project. This will help expedite affordable housing creation.
- Family Homelessness Initiative – Thanks to a planning grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and additional funding from United Way, King County is currently working on a plan to address the unique needs of homeless families. Partners include Seattle, Building Changes and the Washington Families Fund, and the Seattle and the King County housing authorities. In addition to the creation of affordable housing, the plan will look at education and employment, transportation, child care, health care,

mental health and substance abuse and other services needed to build family stability and end family homelessness. The final plan will be completed in early 2010.

- Veterans and Human Services (VHS) Levy – The voters of King County approved the VHS Levy in 2005, creating a dedicated fund source of approximately \$13 million a year for seven years to provide housing and other assistance for veterans, military personnel and their families and others in need. A Service Improvement Plan, prepared for and adopted by the County Council in 2006, identifies service area priorities and describes 31 unique programs and projects. Two advisory boards – a Veterans Levy Oversight Board and a Regional Human Services Levy Oversight Board – provide input and oversight to levy activities. Levy funding has supported a wide range of housing and community services. Levy capital funding is helping to build new units of housing for low-income and homeless veterans and others in need. Funding for the mobile medical van provides outreach to homeless individuals. The Nurse Family Partnership provided by Public Health-Seattle & King County (PHSKC) has expanded with levy funds, providing more home visits for low-income mothers and babies. Other levy-funded efforts are helping screen and assist older adults with depression and are strengthening low-income families. The first in a series of evaluation reports was published in 2009, focused on veterans' services. Subsequent evaluation reports will look at progress in the other three key strategy areas of ending homelessness, increasing access to behavioral health services, and strengthening at risk families.
- Veterans' Program Expansion – With levy dollars, King County has greatly expanded and enhanced the Veterans' Program. Improving geographic access, a new office opened at WorkSource Renton, as well as weekly service hours in Auburn, and weekly or monthly satellite offices are open at eight locations around the county. Capacity was increased to provide financial assistance, housing, counseling, and other services to more veterans. Individualized services were enhanced through case management and access to post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) treatment was increased, with 95.7 percent reporting improved functioning. The Veterans Incarcerated Program expanded to provide housing, treatment and other supports to veterans exiting county jails, resulting in a savings of over 6,000 jail bed days.
- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Stimulus Funding – CSD has been very successful in applying for and receiving ARRA grants. The awards include: Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grant Funding (\$1 million); Neighborhood Stabilization Program (Round 1 award of \$2.2 million to purchase and rehabilitate foreclosed properties for affordable homeownership and homeless housing); CDBG (\$1.6 million to improve infrastructure and provide housing); Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Funds (\$1.8 million to help homeless people move quickly into stable housing); Work Training Summer Youth Program (\$1.6 million to provide summer employment for low-income youth); and Work Training Adult Dislocated Worker Program (\$1.4 million to provide job search assistance and training for adults who have been laid off from their jobs). Still pending is a potential Round 2 Neighborhood Stabilization Program award (\$800,000 to \$1 million).
- Work Training Programs – Despite funding cuts in recent years, CSD was able to maintain the programs most successful in providing youth and adults with productive

life skills, training and job opportunities as an alternative to criminal justice involvement. King County Jobs Initiative received a “brownfields” training grant in 2008 from the Environmental Protection Agency, enabling graduates to earn an average wage of \$25.80/hour. YouthSource received the 2008 *Award of Excellence* from the U.S. Department of Labor as the most outstanding youth employment training program in the country, exemplified by its innovative summer youth pilot program designed to promote and teach “green” jobs to at-risk youth. This pilot was expanded and enhanced in 2009 with federal ARRA funds, allowing education and employment opportunities for 560 at-risk youth.

- SkillUp – Leaders around the region joined together in 2008 to form an employment and training collaborative for Seattle-King County. While still in the early stages, it presents opportunities for improvements in the alignment of regional resources and programs to help low-income people achieve portable post-secondary credentials and the hope for better paying jobs and job advancement. One of these projects is the effort to develop programs tailored to people already working, in order to give low-wage earning adults a “second chance” at education and employment success on a living wage career track. Partners include the Workforce Development Council, City of Seattle, the local community colleges, United Way and several foundations.

### **Developmental Disabilities Division**

- Birth to Three Program Expansion – Beginning in 2009, all King County school districts now provide birth to three services for infants and toddlers with developmental delays. It is widely understood that early recognition and intervention are keys to success later in life, and the expansion of these services will help children for generations to come. However DDD struggles to meet the increased demand without any increases in state funding. A statewide effort is underway to study the demand and the costs of providing birth to three services. Finding a funding solution for mandated birth to three services will be a priority issue for developmental disabilities advocates in the 2010 legislative session.
- Employment – King County continues to be a nationally recognized leader in the development and provision of employment opportunities for people with developmental disabilities. The School to Work Project now serves 17 of 19 school districts in King County, helping youth gain job readiness skills and training in preparation for entering the workforce upon graduation from high school. As a means to increase community employment opportunities for adults with developmental disabilities, DDD convened a Business Leadership Advisory Committee in 2009 with members from many of the largest Northwest companies including REI, Boeing, Nordstrom, Seattle Children’s Hospital and more. They meet to strategize ways to create accessible job opportunities and open doors to employment for people with disabilities, building upon the successful employment programs already in place.
- Three-Year Service Plan for 2010-2013 – King County is required by the state to have service plans in place to describe how the county will expend its state funding. The next plan for birth to three early intervention services, adult employment and family supports is due by December 31, 2009.



## **Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division**

- Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) – In 2005, the Washington State Legislature created an option for counties to raise the local sales tax by 0.1 percent to augment state funding for mental health and chemical dependency services and therapeutic courts. This funding was to be used for new or enhanced programs and services only. In 2007, after more than a year of planning and community involvement, the King County Council adopted the MIDD Action Plan and approved the sales tax increase.

In 2008, MHCADSD completed three detailed plans required by the council: an oversight plan, an implementation plan, and an evaluation plan. As part of the oversight plan, a 30-person Oversight Committee was convened whose role is to ensure that implementation of the MIDD strategies and programs is transparent, accountable, collaborative and effective. The implementation plan identifies specific strategies to improve connections to community treatment services, reduce involvement in adult and juvenile justice systems, and enhance prevention strategies to help youth and families. The evaluation plan looks to ensure the programs are effective.

As of the end of the second quarter of 2009, a total of \$5.3 million had been expended on MIDD programs and over 700 individuals had received mental health or substance abuse services. In all, 30 of the 37 strategies in the Action Plan have been implemented and 77 community providers have received contracts to provide services.

While the original state legislation allowed expenditures only on *new* services, the county's continuing budget challenges helped to bring about a significant change. In the 2009 session, the legislation was amended and for a period of five years, counties will be allowed to use a portion of MIDD revenues to supplant lost funding for base mental health, substance abuse and specialty court programs. The 2010 budget makes use of this provision, seeking to balance both the need to preserve funding for base services while still moving forward with the system improvements and enhancements needed to break the cycles of recidivism and hospitalization. A revised financial plan will reflect the 2010 budget, and adjustments will be made to implementation timelines.

- Criminal Justice Initiatives – When the county moved to close two aging facilities that had served people with mental health and substance abuse issues and criminal justice involvement, it chose to reinvest the savings in programs that would provide alternatives to incarceration and reduce justice costs by improving access and linkages to treatment services. The initiatives, begun in 2004, are coordinated by MHCADSD. Partners include PHSKC, Adult and Juvenile Detention, Mental Health Court, and Drug Court. The initiatives facilitate access and linkages to mental health and substance abuse treatment, support the Community Center for Alternative Programs (CCAP), and improve connections to housing and community services. Annual evaluation reports show that the programs and process improvements are making a difference. The numbers of jail bookings have been significantly reduced and about half of participants have had positive treatment dispositions, particularly those in the co-occurring disorder program and those referred by specialty courts. Criminal justice liaisons are helping to

improve access and referral to treatment services, and the onsite benefits application workers are facilitating enrollment in Medicaid and drug/alcohol treatment programs. The housing voucher program has shown significant reductions in jail bookings every year, underscoring the importance of stable housing for people coming out of jail.

- Mental Health Recovery Plan – The King County Council approved an ordinance in 2006 that guides the transformation of the publicly funded mental health system to one based on recovery principles. The Mental Health Recovery Plan entails three phases over a period of five years, recognizing that system change cannot happen overnight. Phase One brought about a shared vision of recovery among the system stakeholders. Phase Two created system changes, including financial and reimbursement structures to sustain the foundation of a recovery-oriented system. Phase Three (2008-2010) is developing and increasing system depth and complexity toward full implementation. Recovery performance measures and financial incentives have been put in place to encourage agencies to strive for and achieve recovery outcomes for their clients. These include incentives in provider contracts to increase opportunities for consumer job training and employment – a key component of recovery. Other contract requirements call for progress in implementing the agency’s individual recovery work plan. A Recovery Web page was created, offering a wealth of information for consumers and family members. Training events for providers and consumers were held in 2008, with more planned for 2009-2010 including training to prepare consumers to become paid peer support specialists in community mental health agencies.
- Intensive Treatment Programs – Three programs work to facilitate access to housing, treatment and intensive community supports to help very fragile clients achieve stable lives in the community rather than costly hospitals or jails. The Program for Assertive Community Treatment (PACT) helps high utilizers of hospital services; the Forensic Assertive Community Treatment (FACT) program helps high utilizers of jails and the justice system; and the Forensic Intensive Supportive Housing (FISH) program utilizes a “housing first” approach to provide immediate supportive housing for homeless persons linked to treatment.
- Substance Abuse Treatment – The division coordinates prevention, intervention, treatment and aftercare services to provide a continuum of care for people with substance abuse and chemical dependency issues. Continued use of the Global Assessment of Individual Needs (GAIN) – a standardized clinical assessment tool used to diagnose, place and plan treatment for youth and adults – has helped King County achieve improvement in treatment completion and retention rates, including the highest completion rates for youth in the state. A successful redesign of the Emergency Services Patrol and sobering services was completed in 2008.

### **Office of the Public Defender**

- Public Defense Payment Model Revision – The King County Council requires a revision of the Public Defense Payment Model every three years. Months of work yielded an updated and revised budget methodology to calculate the costs to provide contract indigent public defense services in King County. The report submitted to and approved by the King County Council was developed in conjunction with DCHS and

the Office of Management and Budget, with input from and in collaboration with the King County Bar Association and the non-profit public defense providers. The council approved the revised Public Defense Payment Model on June 1, 2009.

- State Public Defense Funding for Quality Improvements – The state provides some funding for counties to achieve quality improvements for public defense services. King County OPD used its state funding to achieve the following improvements:
  1. Additional funding for juvenile caseloads allowed OPD to reduce caseloads from 330 cases per attorney per year to get closer to the WSBA standard of 250 cases per attorney per year – a nearly one-third reduction in juvenile offender caseload and a significant difference in the quality of representation.
  2. An increase for conflict counsel compensation (the first increase in many years) raised hourly payments for assigned cases. While still far below market rate, the increase has assisted in retention of experienced conflict attorneys and the addition of new conflict attorneys.
  3. Funding was used for increased oversight of contract agencies and assigned counsel and for training programs, such as quarterly assigned counsel brown bag meetings at which Continuing Legal Education (CLE) training on a variety of topics takes place. Topics included the Interstate Compact on Adult Offender Supervision, search and seizure issues, upcoming changes in Superior Court scheduling, and jail services for clients with mental health and drug dependency problems. One-day CLE programs were also held in 2008 and 2009 dealing with adolescent brain development, client communication issues and cross-examination. In addition, three-day trial advocacy training programs were held in both May 2008 and May 2009. Attorney feedback on these CLEs has been overwhelmingly positive.
- E-filing of Criminal Case Management Documents – The OPD modified procedures to accommodate electronic filing of criminal case documents, which will reduce paperwork and help to speed case assignment information contractor defense agencies.
- E-management of Expert Requests – The OPD transitioned to e-management of expert requests, improving computerized logging and access to documents, as well as storage of documents in e-files rather than hard copies to more efficiently handle an increased workload from Superior Court.
- Improved Data Access – Working with Information Technology staff, OPD developed new reports to improve access to case assignment data for assigned counsel cases, and also developed new methods for accessing information on expert witness costs.
- Case Weighting Study and Steering Committee – The OPD was instrumental in the forming of a steering committee to provide oversight of a comprehensive case weighting study, as well as staffing and assisting with coordination of the consultant's study that will be completed in early 2010.

- Extraordinary Criminal Justice Act Funds – In conjunction with the OMB, OPD was instrumental in the application process to the State of Washington to request funds to help defray 2008 aggravated murder case costs.

## **Change Dynamics**

A number of internal and external forces are impacting budgets, service delivery, program implementation, and both short and long-range planning. State budget cuts in the 2009 session coupled with a continuing county budget crisis are resulting in cuts to mental health, chemical dependency, and community services in 2009 and 2010. State funding for developmental disabilities programs is not keeping pace with the growing demand for these services. A lack of sufficient state funding for mandated public defense services constitutes a continuing challenge to provide legal counsel to indigent defendants.

At the same time, the department is fortunate for the revenues from the Veterans and Human Services Levy, the MIDD sales tax, document recording fees supporting homeless housing and supportive services, Public Defense Improvement Funds, and funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. With elimination of most general fund dollars from the department, in no other year and at no other time in recent memory have these alternative fund sources been more critical to the continuation, and even survival, of DCHS programs and services.

A summary of the key issues, challenges and change dynamics on the horizon follows.

## **Director's Office**

- Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness – Now, more than ever, investments are needed to create affordable housing linked to supportive services. Nationally validated studies have proven that our programs reduce emergency service spending in amounts far greater than the cost of operating the programs. The CEHKC is entering the “middle years” of implementation, with a considerable way to go toward achieving the goal of creating 9,500 new units of housing. The Funders Group is working on additional areas of collaboration as a means of accelerating development of housing. Legislative advocacy in 2010 will be very important, as a means of preserving and hopefully increasing investments in housing. Unfortunately, the continuing recession is causing reductions in funding at a time when the need is greatest. In addition, some fund sources originally intended to increase efforts to prevent homelessness or create housing are being used instead to maintain current levels of service, such as the supplantation of MIDD revenues and document recording fees. Without increased investments, the region will not be able to make needed headway in the effort to end homelessness. The challenge for the CEHKC is to keep the commitment alive, the partners and stakeholders involved, and the pressure on legislators and other funders to invest in the services and supports necessary to achieve the goals of the Ten Year Plan.
- Accountable Business Transformation (ABT) Implementation – The department is preparing for the advent of the new ABT program designed to streamline, standardize and integrate business processes countywide. This will mean changes to budget, finance, human resources and payroll systems. This involves considerable staff time

and effort, particularly in fiscal management and information systems, but it is hoped that the transition will yield improvements well worth the investment of resources.

- Emergency Response Coordination – The Continuity of Operations Plan describes how business continuity will be ensured in the event of a catastrophic event. However, the possibility of multiple catastrophic events, e.g., flooding coupled with a severe outbreak of H1N1 influenza may render even our best laid plans inadequate. The department continues to explore issues, problems and solutions with our many partners in criminal justice, public health and human services to attempt to prepare both our employees and our contractors for any significant occurrence or series of events.

### **Community Services Division**

- Need for a Long-term Funding Solution for Community Services – The county’s budget crisis impacts county-funded safety net services the community has come to count on. These include aging services, youth and family services, sexual assault and domestic violence services, information and referral, and some work training and housing and homelessness programs. As none of these services is “mandated,” they will suffer substantial reductions or elimination in 2010. Finding a solution to the county’s structural financial deficit was a priority in the last legislative session, and one of the county’s strongest partners in that advocacy was the human services community through the King County Alliance for Human Services. The human services providers worked very hard to advocate for additional funding tools for county governments, and have already pledged to return to Olympia in 2010 to do so again.
- Veterans and Human Services (VHS) Levy – The majority of the procurement plans and program designs for the 31 strategies in the Service Improvement Plan are now in some stage of implementation. The two levy oversight boards and CSD have turned their attention to contract monitoring, improving and strengthening performance measures and evaluation tools, and providing public information and education about the ways in which the levy is improving people’s lives and strengthening families and communities. It is imperative to increase efforts to demonstrate to local governments and the public that levy dollars are being put to good use. Certainly the continuing deployment of men and women overseas keeps the issue of veterans’ needs in front of the people. Given the uncertainty of human services funding on the horizon, it is more important than ever to show success and gain public support for levy renewal in 2011.
- Veterans’ Program Issues – Service needs for veterans, military personnel and their families continue to change. One cohort of veterans (World War II, Korea and Vietnam) is aging, with issues related to income and disability. Another increasing cohort is the men and women who served or are currently serving (often with multiple deployments) in Afghanistan and Iraq. The Veterans’ Program is collaborating with its key stakeholders, including members of both the Veterans’ Program Advisory Board and the Veterans Levy Oversight Board, to address these changing needs. Emerging issues include major depression and other mental health issues, traumatic brain injuries, and increases in PTSD affecting both veterans and their families.

- Walthew Building – The Veterans’ Program is housed in the Walthew Building. The lease expires in 2011 and the space is inadequate. A decision must be reached on where to relocate the office.
- McKinney Homeless Assistance Grants – Each year, Seattle and King County collaborate on a joint application for McKinney Homeless Assistance funds to sustain the operation of housing and supportive service programs, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing for people with serious disabilities, and two Safe Haven facilities for severely mentally ill people who have been homeless. The region has historically had a successful grant application and was awarded \$19.7 million for 2009, but for the first time in many years did not receive funding for any new projects. While the federal government does not appear to be reducing its commitment to McKinney, it is restructuring the grant application and funding priorities. As a result, some of the homeless services (non-housing) historically funded with McKinney dollars must be moved from the grant if our region is to remain competitive for additional McKinney housing dollars. King County and its partners must be more effective in their performance to maximize funding opportunities, and must strategize ways to ensure funding for the critical services McKinney can no longer fund.
- Homeless Housing and Services Funds – Document recording fee revenues are reduced, owing to the marked reduction in housing transactions in recent years. The document recording fees were created to help counties fund homeless housing and supportive services in support of their ten year plans. The legislature, recognizing that revenues were down, approved a temporary small increase beginning in 2009, which will help to somewhat offset the shortfall, but funding is still less than projected years ago when the fees were first created. In earlier years, the county awarded several multi-year awards (three to five years) for housing development and operations, and some of those projects are up for renewal. Given that revenues are down, there are fewer dollars available to award in 2009-2010. With the need to repurpose some of the document recording fees to supplant lost funding for county funded homeless services, there is fear that in the near future there may be insufficient funds to cover the expiring projects (a “bow wave”), and little or no funding available for new projects.
- Housing and Community Development Federal Funding – King County serves as the regional coordinator of federal housing funds that are critical to the county’s ability to provide emergency assistance, improve economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, and create low-income, special needs and affordable housing. King County has been very successful in applying for ARRA funds, which will stimulate local housing development, homeless stabilization and homeless prevention efforts, and help shore up funding lost through supplantation and state reductions to their earlier housing commitments. However, it is important to note that ARRA funds are one-time only funds and not sustainable. Affordable housing production and homeless prevention efforts represent ongoing needs and depend on ongoing resources.
- Education and Employment – In previous years, the Work Training Program experienced significant cuts in federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funding, due partly to reduction of the federal appropriation and partly to the Washington State unemployment rate being relatively lower than other states. Now, however, federal

WIA funding is being expanded thanks to ARRA economic stimulus funding. King County has successfully applied for ARRA funding for at-risk youth education and training programs and adult dislocated worker programs, helping to backfill lost county funds and helping youth and adults to achieve self-sufficiency. Again, it is important to remember that ARRA funds are temporary and will not sustain programs long-term.

### **Developmental Disabilities Division**

- State Funding – State funding has not kept pace with the growth in demand for services for infants and toddlers with developmental delays and for adults with developmental disabilities and their families. Funding for supportive services was first implemented to help people with developmental disabilities move from institutions to community living and continued funding for those services and supports are critical. The DDD has been able to absorb some of the growth in demand with fund balance, but this is not sustainable. The developmental disabilities community has a very strong legislative advocacy component, expected to be at full force in the 2010 session.
- Possible Move of Birth to Three to Early Learning – There is a potential for a move of the state's Birth to Three Program from the state Developmental Disabilities Division to the state Department of Early Learning. This would place it with other early child development programs devoted to helping Washington's children get ready for school and life. It would, therefore, be a compatible placement. Should this happen, there may be organizational or planning requirements particular to the move to a new department that DDD is not yet aware of but that will need to be accomplished. At the county level, the DDD would remain unchanged within DCHS.

### **Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division**

- State Budget – The State Legislature made dramatic cuts to both mental health and substance abuse services in the 2009 session. Even in the fall of 2009, the state continued to announce additional reductions. The MHCADSD has estimated that the millions of dollars of lost state funding will translate to about 1,500 people losing mental health outpatient benefits, and about 1,675 fewer people able to access outpatient chemical dependency treatment services. Although the MIDD will provide avenues for preserving some critical services, many people in need will be unable to get the help they need. Legislative advocacy in 2010 will be critical to forestall any additional major cuts to treatment budgets.
- MIDD Changes – The MIDD partners and Oversight Committee will revise the original spending and implementation plans to adjust to the supplantation of MIDD revenues and the resulting slow-down or postponement of certain of the proposed programs and strategies. It is obviously critical to have the base services as a stable foundation for improvements or enhancements, but it is unfortunate to lose the momentum of the new initiatives. The division will proceed with development of the new initiatives as funding allows. Very exciting enhancements will move forward, such as a stronger wraparound services program for at-risk youth and families and planning for a new adult crisis diversion facility, which will greatly help to divert people from incarceration to community mental health and substance abuse treatment.

- Boarding – King County has a serious shortfall in the number of inpatient beds for people in psychiatric crisis. As a result, it is often the case that a person needing a psychiatric bed is “boarded” in an emergency room for long periods of time waiting for a bed to open. This has potentially grave consequences. Recent actions by the state threaten to make this problem worse in 2010 as fewer state beds are available. The lack of funding and availability of psychiatric beds urgently needs a solution. A crisis diversion facility that is part of the MIDD plan is scheduled to open in the spring of 2010 and is expected to help ease the boarding problem.
- Criminal Justice Initiatives: Working with other departments and community partners, DCHS and MHCADSD remain committed to reducing criminal justice involvement of persons with mental illness and chemical dependency by improving connections to treatment and creating alternatives to incarceration. The Criminal Justice Initiatives have proven successful in helping individuals reclaim their lives, improve their health and stability, and reduce the county’s criminal justice costs. Originally supported with county general funds, the Criminal Justice Initiatives have been sustained in 2010 with supplantation funding from the MIDD revenues. Several of the service enhancements proposed in the MIDD Action Plan build on and complement the Criminal Justice Initiatives, making preservation of the initiatives critical to the MIDD plan. However, supplantation is only a temporary solution, as the legislature will allow it for only a few years and at increasingly smaller amounts.
- Potential Loss of Prevention Programs – The state is considering the possibility of discontinuing county drug and alcohol prevention programs and moving this function to the state. The MHCADSD has worked to develop a strong continuum of care for substance abuse services that spans prevention, intervention, treatment, and aftercare services. To improve and enhance community outreach efforts, the division moved to couple its prevention and community mobilization programs. Loss of the local prevention component removes an important element of the continuum. It is far more effective – both from a program and a fiscal perspective – to continue local provision of prevention services as part of the continuum.
- Mental Health Recovery Plan Implementation – The Mental Health Recovery Plan relies on funding from the state and the county (through the MIDD) to support employment programs and services, incentive payments to agencies that achieve employment outcomes, housing stability, treatment services and other supports. Continued implementation of the Recovery Plan, particularly the education and training components for peers and provider staff will be dependent on adequate funding.

### **Office of the Public Defender**

- State Budget Issues – State law and the U.S. Constitution mandate that public defense services be available to persons who are indigent and faced with a jailable offense. That requirement, in the face of inadequate state funding, is a continuing challenge. King County has an extraordinary burden of aggravated murder and death penalty cases and the costs for the defense services are staggering, yet the county receives very little extraordinary justice funding from the state. Becca cases, a state-mandated



program for At-Risk Youth and Child in Need of Services (ARY/CHINS) petitions and truancy, are funded far below the demand for services, as is funding for dependency parents' representation. The OPD will continue to work with criminal justice partners to try to find solutions to these funding problems.

- Ongoing Public Defense Contract Related Budget Issues – In the 2008 Adopted Budget, the King County Council moved OPD contracts to a fiscal year (July to June) despite the fact that all other criminal justice agencies, and county government as a whole, operates on a calendar year budget. This has created a requirement for OPD staff to create, in effect, two six-month budgets and to work on budgets almost year round - working in the summer and fall to support the county executive's budget submittal, in the fall and winter as the council finalizes the calendar budget, and then winter and spring to prepare the fiscal year OPD budget. Contract issues are also difficult, as changes to criminal justice procedures are often made by criminal justice partners in concert with their calendar year budget decisions, necessitating potential re-negotiations of current contracts even as OPD gears up for new contracts. Thus, the change has not, so far, yielded efficiencies for OPD or for King County and changes are proposed for 2010.
- Public Defense Payment Model/Case Weighting Study – In 2009, the council approved a public defense payment model to guide contracts and payments for public defense services. At that time, the council stated that they felt there was insufficient information on the costs of providing appropriate legal counsel in all areas of public defense case work, and directed OPD to coordinate a study to gather more information. The council required selection of an expert consultant and creation of an oversight committee to assist in the effort. The Steering Committee has been selected and is engaged in efforts to approve the required work plan, schedule, budget, and selection criteria for the expert consultant. Per the council ordinance, the scope of work must contain a review of the current public defense caseload; a review of caseloads at comparable jurisdictions around the country; a discussion of key differences and similarities between the complexity of caseloads faced by felony attorneys in King County and other jurisdictions around the country; a review of the advantages and disadvantages of a methodology change to a case-weighting methodology for paying for public defense services; and a recommendation as to whether the county should switch to a case-weighting methodology. The consultant's work is to be completed by April 30, 2010. It is uncertain at this time how the results of the case weighting study may impact public defense services and budgeting in the future.
- Law Enforcement Related Caseload Increase – Information from the Washington State Patrol (WSP) indicates that the WSP will use new federal funding to add seven or eight troopers in King County (21 statewide) starting in July 2010 as part of a Target Zero campaign (working to reduce traffic fatalities to zero). The WSP estimates an increase of 1,200 new Driving Under the Influence cases per year in King County. The federal funding is for two years, but if the program is successful, WSP will seek continuing funding from the state. The amount of the impact on OPD is unclear at this time.
- Walthew Building – The main OPD offices are housed in the Walthew Building. The lease expires in 2011 and a decision must be made on where to relocate those offices.

- Dolan Lawsuit – Public defense contractors filed a lawsuit related to employee benefits. A court ruling in February 2009 found for the contractors, saying that public defense contractors are public employees for the purposes of the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS). The ruling implied that there is no valid reason for the contractors to not be paid benefits consistent with other public employees. Damages were not determined as part of this ruling and it is uncertain at this time what the total impacts might be to the county. King County has appealed this decision.
- Ongoing County Budget Crisis Impacts on OPD – The ongoing shortfall of general fund revenue for the next two-three budget years adds pressure on OPD administrative services. The loss of MIDD funds for expansion of therapeutic court activities and other system improvements due to supplantation also impacts OPD.
- Becca/Truancy – In early 2009, the Court of Appeals, Division I, through its decision in *Bellevue School District v. E.S.* greatly expanded the right to counsel for children in truancy cases, which in turn greatly increases the cost of providing attorneys in a larger number of cases. State funding to King County for Becca cases has not been increased. OPD is coordinating with the court and other criminal justice partners in efforts to find diversion alternatives to the truancy petition process. King County has appealed this decision to the Washington Supreme Court, with a decision likely late 2010.

## **Objectives and Strategies**

Six primary objectives are identified, all of which directly support one or more of the five DCHS goals. The key strategies to be employed to achieve those goals and objectives are detailed below. Some of the strategies in the original MIDD Action Plan are delayed, due to the need to supplant some of the MIDD funds to sustain critical base programs and may not be listed here if unlikely to move forward in 2010. However, most will proceed in whole or part as originally planned at a later time.

### **Objective 1: Reduce adult contacts with the King County criminal justice system**

1. Proceed with the MIDD Action Plan strategies and expend MIDD revenues to prevent or reduce involvement in the criminal justice system, including the following:
  - Increased access to mental health and substance abuse services for people not enrolled in Medicaid
  - Increased outreach and engagement services to people in hospitals, jails or crisis facilities
  - Development of a new crisis diversion center, respite beds and behavioral health crisis teams
  - Continued increased capacity for jail liaison and jail re-entry programs.
2. Continue the successful Criminal Justice Initiatives and other collaborations with Public Health, Adult and Juvenile Detention and the courts to achieve reductions in the utilization of law enforcement, courts and jails by facilitating access to chemical

- dependency and mental health treatment services and supporting Community Center for Alternative Programs (CCAP) treatment programs.
3. Continue the successful Veterans Incarcerated Project with the use of Veterans Program and Veterans Levy dollars in an ongoing effort to help veterans in the criminal justice system to stabilize their lives and reduce recidivism.
  4. Continue utilization of the King County Jobs Initiative to assist low-income persons exiting the criminal justice system to gain job skills and training to achieve livable wage employment.
  5. Continue innovative programs that create stability through supportive housing for people with mental illness, chemical dependency or co-occurring disorders, such as the Supportive Housing Intervention for Transition to Stability (SHIFTS), Program for Assertive Community Treatment (PACT), Forensic Assertive Community Treatment (FACT) and Forensic Intensive Supportive Housing (FISH) Program.
  6. To the extent that resources allow, continue the successful community treatment programs for mentally ill offenders and dangerous mentally ill offenders that provide discharge planning prior to release from prisons along with treatment services, housing and other supports to foster a safe and successful return to the community.

**Objective 2: Increase positive behaviors for youth**

1. Proceed with the MIDD Action Plan strategies targeted to helping youth and their families, including the following:
  - School based mental health and substance abuse services
  - School based suicide prevention
  - Expansion of wraparound services
  - Expanded juvenile court and family treatment court services
  - Expanded crisis intervention services for youth.
2. Continue the nationally recognized, evidence-based *Science to Service* chemical dependency treatment program, a successful collaboration between MHCADSD and King County Superior Court that is helping to achieve higher treatment retention and completion rates for youth and reductions in justice system involvement.
3. Continue proven strategies in the Work Training Program and YouthSource to reach and serve youth/young adults who have dropped out of school or are at risk of dropping out, in order to help them link to treatment services, avoid gang or criminal activity, and achieve high school graduation or a GED.
4. Continue evidence-based collaborations with the courts and other partners around Functional Family Therapy, Multi-systemic Therapy, and other programs for justice involved youth and those most at risk of involvement.

5. Continue collaborations with the state and the MacArthur Foundation *Models for Change* and other partners involved in the multi-system reform effort called the King County System Integration Initiative to improve access to and coordination of mental health and other supportive services for youth in the juvenile justice system.

**Objective 3: Prevent individuals from becoming homeless and assist individuals to acquire stable housing**

1. Continue the enhanced resource and policy coordination for homeless housing, supportive services and rental assistance and operating support facilitated by the CEHKC Funders Group and exemplified in the combined NOFA application rounds.
2. Proceed with planning efforts, in concert with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and United Way of King County, to develop and implement new regional strategies focused on the needs of homeless families in order to move them more quickly into permanent housing with linkages to the services they need to achieve long-term self-sufficiency.
3. Proceed with MIDD Action Plan strategies targeted to ending homelessness, including:
  - Increased outreach and engagement and respite services to individuals leaving hospitals and jails
  - Increased access to mental health and substance abuse outpatient services for people not on Medicaid
  - Development of permanent supportive housing options.
4. Expand homeless prevention efforts through the Housing Stability Program, VHS Levy, ARRA, and other homeless prevention and rapid re-housing programs, including improving discharge planning for people exiting hospitals, jails and foster care.
5. Continue efforts to develop new permanent supportive housing units for homeless persons using VHS Levy dollars, MIDD revenues, document recording fees, and other fund sources.
6. Continue the homeless outreach and engagement strategies developed through the VHS Levy Service Improvement Plan and the CEHKC.
7. Continue efforts to link housing with supportive services as described in the VHS Levy Service Improvement Plan, the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness, and the MIDD Action Plan.
8. Continue support for the Landlord Liaison Project addressing barriers to housing for people who are or were homeless through agreements with landlords to relax standard screening criteria in return for assurances of support services, emergency funds for move-in assistance and damage deposits, and a landlord risk mitigation fund.
9. Continue to manage the collaborative process to develop and submit the annual combined Seattle/King County McKinney Homeless Assistance grant application for

housing and supportive services, with an emphasis on identifying and incorporating any necessary changes to the application to make it more competitive.

**Objective 4: Assist individuals to complete education and training goals and place individuals in stable jobs**

1. Provide employment counseling and re-training for adult dislocated workers to help them learn new job skills and secure livable wage employment and utilize federal ARRA funds to best advantage to assist these efforts.
2. To the extent resources allow, provide education and job training programs to both in-school and out-of-school youth and utilize federal ARRA funds to augment local and regional efforts to assist at-risk youth to prepare for self-sufficiency as adults.
3. Continue the SkillUp Workforce Development Collaborative to foster funding alignment and coordination, opportunities for development of post-secondary education credentials and other programming to offer low-income working adults more opportunities for education and employment advancement.
4. Work in collaboration with the Developmental Disabilities Business Leadership Committee, the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, and other employment partners to help adults with developmental disabilities prepare for and achieve and maintain employment in the community.
5. Continue to assist youth with developmental disabilities to achieve work experience through the School to Work Project to the extent resources allow.
6. Continue the provision of employment counseling, case management, and other services for veterans, parents exiting the criminal justice system, and other low-income people in need utilizing VHS Levy funds.
7. Continue efforts to transform public mental health to a recovery-based system, including providing incentives to providers that offer vocational and employment programs for people in recovery from mental illness and show progress in helping clients achieve employment outcomes.
8. Proceed with MIDD Action Plan strategies that strengthen employment services for people with mental illness.
9. Continue to support and evaluate the success of VHS Levy employment initiatives designed to help adults exiting the criminal justice system and link educational, vocational and employment opportunities to housing and supportive services for veterans and other low-income individuals.

**Objective 5: Assure the availability of developmental and behavioral healthcare so that vulnerable populations can be as physically and mentally fit as possible**

1. Implement MIDD Action Plan strategies that promote access to community treatment, support and assist children and youth, and help people access treatment as an alternative to incarceration or hospitalization.
2. Continue efforts in the VHS Levy Service Improvement Plan to increase access to behavioral health services by enhancing integration of mental health and substance abuse services with primary care at community clinics and public health centers.
3. Continue planning for and provision of cross-training for service providers on trauma sensitive services, PTSD treatment and evidence-based practices, and accessing Veterans Administration systems and services as outlined in the VHS Levy Service Improvement Plan.
4. Continue efforts to enhance services to treat depression in chronically ill and disabled elderly veterans and other older adults in need, as well as for seniors who have transitioned from homelessness to permanent housing, as provided by the VHS Levy.
5. Continue to work with the state and other partners to seek solutions to the issue of insufficient mental health psychiatric treatment beds.
6. Continue the intensive service programs for people with mental illness, chemical dependency and co-occurring disorders (e.g., SHIFTS, PACT, FACT and FISH) to provide intensive case management services and supportive housing to help the most at-risk individuals live successfully in the community.
7. To the extent resources are available, continue efforts to improve access to early intervention services for infants and toddlers with developmental delays, and continue efforts to ensure compliance with the federal government's requirement to provide these services in natural environments.
8. Continue planning efforts for the Partnership for Health Improvement through Shared Information (PHISI), which has the goal of improving the health of individuals through real time care coordination, services tracking and collaboration among providers using shared information (e.g., via electronic health records, electronic patient monitoring/registries, health information exchange, clinical messaging).

**Objective 6: Provide quality public defense services**

1. Utilize state funding under the public defense improvement fund to improve King County's public defense system – develop ongoing legal training and education for public defense and assigned counsel attorneys in order to improve knowledge and competency, and continue to explore training needs and issues on an ongoing basis.
2. Continue efforts, in collaboration with the Prosecuting Attorney and the courts, to coordinate the expedited felony expansion program that allows for reduction of

- charges from felony to misdemeanor charges for a large number of simple possession drug and property offenses.
3. As funds allow, continue collaboration on the MIDD initiatives to expand therapeutic courts.
  4. Continue to advocate for adequate state funding for Becca caseloads to meet the increasing demand for services, and for state funding for dependency parents' representation. Work with the State Legislature to gain reimbursement for extraordinary criminal justice funding from the state for aggravated murder cases.
  5. Complete the case weighting study to provide greater depth of information to guide contracting and payments for public defense services.
  6. Continue coordination with the courts and other criminal justice partners in efforts to find diversion alternatives to the truancy petition process.
  7. Continue efforts in system planning and workgroups throughout the adult and juvenile justice systems in King County, in order to track all changes, issues and proposals that may impact the provision of public defense services in King County and make suggestions for improvements as appropriate.

### **Prioritization Criteria – Use of County Funds**

King County government has insufficient funding tools to raise the revenues needed to pay for current levels of county services. Efforts in the 2009 legislative session were largely unsuccessful in gaining new revenue, but did gain new mechanisms for increasing funding flexibility that did not previously exist – specifically, the use of MIDD revenues and document recording fees for purposes of supplanting lost county funds for base mental health, substance abuse, therapeutic courts and homeless housing assistance. With that as a backdrop, DCHS notes the following challenges and corresponding plans for utilizing its limited county funds and the necessary adjustments in the absence of funding.

### **Community Services Division**

There are seven separate funds managed by CSD: Children and Family Services; Work Training Program; Housing Opportunity Fund; Federal Housing and Community Development Program; Veterans Relief Services; Veterans and Families Levy; and the Human Services Levy. While overall priorities are set according to department and division goals and objectives, each of the funds has its own set of legal requirements and limitations.

Children and Families Services (CFS) Fund – Revenue from the CFS Fund is spread across three budgets: Community Services Operating Budget, Work Training Program, and the Housing Opportunity Fund. In previous years, CFS funds were also allocated to Public Health but beginning in 2010, those transfers have been removed. The county's budget crisis caused several other changes to the CFS Fund, the most significant of which is the elimination of general fund dollars.

The Community Services Operating budget has been the most challenging of CSD's seven budgets because of the volatility of one of its chief fund sources, the general fund. The general fund contribution to the CFS fund was substantially reduced in the 2009 budget and is eliminated in the proposed 2010 budget. In 2008, CSD prepared a multi-year General Fund Reduction Plan to show phased-in cuts to its county-funded services. This reduction plan was widely shared with the human services community, in an effort to promote transparency. The funding priorities in CSD's reduction plan were clear: 1) preserve youth programs that prevent entry into the criminal justice system and involve issues of social equity; 2) maintain programs that best meet DCHS goals; and 3) preserve rural/unincorporated services as long as possible.

Following this plan, CSD reduced or eliminated funding for the first tier (year one). Although some were preserved by the County Executive and the County Council in a "lifeboat" scenario in 2009, all have been eliminated in the proposed 2010 budget. These include programs that did not match core business or goals; programs where primary responsibility rested with another level of government; programs not providing a direct service; and programs that did not show clear success. This meant reductions or elimination of base special programs, some homeless services, youth homeless shelters, batterer's treatment, Women's Advisory Board projects, senior centers serving primarily city residents, adult day health, information and referral, some youth work training, reductions to the King County Jobs Initiative, and administrative cuts to the HOF.

In 2010, the CSD budget again follows the published plan with reductions to domestic violence and sexual assault services, senior centers, work training programs for youth (some of these cuts will be offset by federal ARRA funds), and the HOF. Preserved in 2010 are the programs and services identified in the reduction plan as "prioritized to remain at least partially funded" as long as possible, as well as a few programs in the second tier. Those preserved, whether at past levels or reduced levels, include juvenile justice intervention programs, youth and family services, men's and women's emergency winter shelters, senior centers serving primarily rural/unincorporated area older adults, some domestic violence and sexual assault services, King County Jobs Initiative, some youth work training, and funding for the critical operating costs of the HOF.

Work Training Fund – As noted above, CFS funding for the Work Training Fund will be substantially reduced, which translates to reductions to both in and out of school youth programs. However, some of this lost revenue will be offset, at least temporarily, with ARRA funds. The CSD also participated in a state Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration grant application and will receive \$1.27 million for youth work training programs. Some CFS funding for the King County Jobs Initiative, an employment program targeted to adults exiting the criminal justice system, and training and education targeting out of school youth who are often involved in or at risk of involvement in the justice system, will be preserved as long as possible as criminal justice alternatives are a priority service area and the CFS funds help leverage important additional dollars.

Housing Opportunity Fund (HOF) – The HOF, a capital fund, is projected to be lower in 2010 due to one-time revenue appropriated in 2009 that will not be available in 2010 (e.g., capital funds transferred from the MIDD fund and Gates Foundation family homelessness funds). State grant funds to the HOF will be reduced due to state revenue



reductions, and document recording fee revenues are also lower, as already noted. Finally, CFS funding for the HOF will be substantially reduced. The reduced CFS funding will support only the most critical operating costs of the HOF and the county's ARCH dues.

Federal Housing and Community Development Fund – This fund increased over 2009 and anticipates additional revenues for 2010 from ARRA funds for housing production, community development, and homeless prevention.

Veterans Services Fund – This fund is expected to be relatively stable.

Veterans and Families Levy Fund / Human Services Levy Fund – Both funds are expected to be relatively stable.

### **Developmental Disabilities Division**

The Developmental Disabilities Division receives millage county funding and no general fund dollars and, therefore, has no need for a general fund reduction strategy. However, being dependent on the state for the majority of its funding leaves the program vulnerable, given the state's budget crisis. The state reduced funding to King County by \$555,000 and some reductions were necessary to administration and vendor rates as a result. Need currently outstrips available funding and no county funds are available to fill the gap.

### **Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division**

The Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division is primarily funded with state dollars, but previously received county general fund dollars to support the Emergency Services Patrol, the Dutch Shisler Sobering Support Center and the range of programs and services provided under the Criminal Justice Initiatives. With the loss of county general fund dollars for mental health and substance abuse services, the MIDD sales tax revenues will be utilized to preserve and maintain those programs in 2010. This is, however, only a temporary solution as the state legislation allows supplantation for a limited amount and for a limited number of years.

### **Office of the Public Defender**

The Office of the Public Defender (OPD) and its contracts with defense agencies and assigned counsel attorneys are supported by the county general fund. In 2008, the County Council called for development of a detailed review of the King County Public Defense Funding Model. The report was approved in 2009 and forms the basis for current public defense budgeting and county contracts with public defense agencies.

The primary driver of the OPD budget is caseload. Changes that impact caseload are the single most effective way to impact the criminal justice budget. In looking to reduce criminal justice costs, caseload areas and composition can be analyzed and prioritized. Elimination of certain case types is possible via modification of the nature of sanctions available (e.g., truancy detention), expanded or re-doubled pre-filing diversion efforts, or outright decisions not to file or proceed with certain case types. While OPD cannot direct

systemic changes to the criminal justice system, it is a very important partner in the discussions that bring those changes about.

The case weighting work underway may yield system changes that affect public defense contracts and budgets. The case weighting study is one of a number of ongoing efforts to provide greater clarity on public defense service needs and funding. Other efforts focus on caseload monitoring and case load reduction (as a means of reducing costs), examination of Becca cases, and discussions around the rights of minors in truancy cases. These efforts involve the courts (adult and juvenile), the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, and other criminal justice partners.

#### Appendix: Dashboard Reports